

September 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22641

preventative and rehabilitative services associated with a comprehensive program for family planning."

If family planning is a useful tool in providing better health for children and mothers, Mrs. Oettinger declared that "it should be available on a universal basis as a right to parents, without coercion, but with a genuine and sympathetic attention to the needs of each human being." She emphasized that individuals from all faiths should determine freely the family planning methods "morally acceptable to them."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this news story makes reference to the speech made by Katherine Oettinger the day before the article appeared. She is the Chief of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. She has made what, to my mind, is an excellent address on the right of all individuals who desire to have the information to be given whatever information is necessary to plan their families. It is, to my way of thinking, a substantial contribution in the war against poverty.

A NEW BEGINNING IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MANSEFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I desire under the bill.

Acceptance of the OAS plan for peace by both sides has finally cleared the way for a new beginning in the Dominican Republic. That is an achievement of great importance. It is not, however, an end-all for the troubles which have long plagued that unfortunate nation. The problems that existed before the revolution of April 24, exist today. Unemployment is heavy. The city of Santo Domingo, the hub of the country, is piled high with the rubble of bombings, mortar fire, and house-to-house street fighting. People are hungry. Poverty remains the only way of life for the large majority of the Dominican people. Democracy is a promise which remains to be fulfilled.

The new provisional government under Hector Garcia Godoy faces a monumental task. The months ahead need to be used and used well to bring about a national reconciliation. Dominicans now must turn their common efforts toward building a society in which democracy will be meaningful for all Dominicans, where economic opportunity and social justice will be more than a distant promise.

The Institutional Act devised by the OAS three-man group seems to be an eminently fair basis on which to build an effective interim government and to restore order out of the state of chaos which has crippled the Dominican Republic for the past 4 months. It is under this act that Hector Garcia Godoy, a mutually acceptable provisional president, has been appointed. He has designated, in turn, a cabinet to serve his government. Free elections, supervised by the OAS, will be held in 9 months. All parties are to suspend political activities for 6 months, that is, until 3 months prior to elections. Human rights are to be guaranteed the Dominican people.

In addition to the Institutional Act, the OAS Commission has also induced both sides to accept the terms of an act of reconciliation, which provides for a general amnesty of all political prisoners; the absorption of rebel territory into the Inter-American Zone of Security; maintenance of the zone for 30 days unless the President requests an extension; submission of all arms to the provisional government; return of all military forces to their barracks; reintegration without penalty of all troops; and negotiations for the withdrawal of the Inter-American Peace Force.

The design and plan of these two acts is a reflection of the outstanding work of the OAS three-man Commission in trying to work out a mutually satisfactory solution to the paralysis which has gripped the Dominican Republic since last April. Our own Ambassador to the OAS, Ellsworth Bunker, along with Brazilian Ambassador Ilmar Penna Marinho and Ramon de Clairmont Duenas of El Salvador have earned the respect and the admiration of the entire Inter-American community for their patience, their understanding and persistent and unbiased diplomacy in providing their good offices to all parties, and for suggesting solutions to bring relief from the interminable warfare. In this Nation, we owe deep thanks to Ambassador Bunker and his colleagues for their wise and tireless efforts to convert this situation into one amenable to peaceful solution.

But their work is only a beginning. The peace is an uneasy one. Suspicions and fears and bitterness run deep. Hostilities could break out again at the slightest provocation. Whatever success the Garcia Godoy government eventually may have will depend on the restraint, the patriotism, and the willingness of leaders on all sides to give their nation a chance to live in peace and harmony.

With acceptance of the plan for peace by both sides, it is possible for the Dominicans to turn to the difficult job of establishing a solid base for a full-scale effort to develop the country, economically and politically. With that base, there is reason to hope that continued cooperation on the part of this Nation with and through the OAS can be helpful in bringing about an economic and social recovery in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] on the bill.

MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the August 28 issue of the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette there is an editorial entitled "What They're for, Not Against," which merits the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This article discusses the program for young people sponsored by Moral Rearmament Demonstration for Modernizing America in Mackinac Island, Mich., this past summer.

This is the same group which produced the hour-long show "Sing Out, 1965,"

which had a Washington showing recently, and which shortly will appear in the Hollywood Bowl, and then go to Asia for showing.

This is a very stimulating program. It is much needed today, particularly in view of some distortions that exist in the minds of people in other countries regarding the attitude of young people in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THEY'RE FOR, NOT AGAINST

There was a big demonstration the other day up on Michigan's Mackinac Island.

More than 3,500 young people from 51 nations didn't make the headlines, however. They demonstrated quietly—not only what they are against, but also what they are for.

It was the Moral Rearmament Demonstration for Modernizing America. Some 350 colleges and schools participated, attracting interest from abroad.

Taking issue with the advocates of moral and military pacifism, noninvolvement, athelism, and the so-called new morality, these youth believe their generation is called on to pattern a society that works. In other words, to match man's tremendous technological growth with a growth in maturity, aim, and character in man himself.

Speaking at this Mackinac demonstration, J. Blanton Belk, U.S. Director of Moral Rearmament, put it this way:

"Youth is being confronted today with the alternatives of being communized, animalized, or modernized. Our purpose is to produce modern men and women who will demonstrate in their own lives the answer and formulate concrete plans and action for tackling the knottiest problems of our times.

One reason we have had riots on the American campuses is because no one has challenged young America to take on creating the right revolution in the whole world. We believe that a new generation can be trained with the character-toughening, problem-solving, Nation-saving skills that this age demands."

It's a challenging concept. It sounds good.

COST OF LIVING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the news media in the past few days have focused attention on a problem which I have long felt should be the subject of a public discussion.

For too long, the questions of the increase in cost-of-living and the inflationary pressures have been downgraded by too many Government officials and so-called experts.

On Monday, September 6, the Washington Post carried the Harris survey, which underscored the concern of the housewives on the cost-of-living increases.

But it took an astute editorial writer for the Washington Evening Star on September 8 to pinpoint the causes. In doing so, this writer ably put the skids to the favorite argument that the farmer is to blame for the rise in food prices.

The writer declared:

To blame the farmer for all the inflation is manifestly unfair. According to Government figures, farmers last year received only 37 cents on every dollar spent at retail counters for food.

22642

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

September 13, 1965

The fact is that the cost-of-living index is computed from a list of some 300 goods and services ranging from refrigerators to haircuts, along with food. To say that farmers are prospering at the expense of city dwellers is to ignore the costly contracts that have been negotiated in auto, aluminum, steel, and other industries in the past year. These are the basic industries that pass on to the whole economy their inflationary settlement.

The housewife may not notice their impact every Friday on her shopping list, but before we impeach the Iowa and Texas meat producers, let's keep in mind that inflation, like termites, usually attack from several directions.

In the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, an article points out that by 1970, the dollar will be worth about 40 cents. And, it warns:

If inflation speeds up, to erode values at a faster rate, the 1970 dollar readily could be worth even less.

It should be stressed that inflation hurts those who can least afford it—those living on pensions, social security payments, and the like. When the value of the dollar, based on 1939, has sunk below 44 cents, as it stands today, the impact is deeply serious.

A superb analysis of the effects of inflation was made by R. K. Bliss, of the extension service of Iowa State University at Ames. I think it merits reading.

I ask unanimous consent that the following articles be placed in the RECORD: First, "Cost-of-Living Rise Brings Criticism From Housewives," from the Washington Post of September 6.

Second, "Meat Counter Blues," from the Washington Star of September 8.

Third, "Thrift and Progress," transcript of a radio talk by R. K. Bliss, September 3.

Fourth, "Is Your Dollar in Trouble Again?" "Outlook for Inflation—What To Do About It," from the September 20 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 1965]

THE HARRIS SURVEY—COST-OF-LIVING RISE BRINGS CRITICISM FROM HOUSEWIVES

(By Louis Harris)

The cost of living is now emerging as a storm that could upset the relative tranquility of consensus that President Johnson has so carefully wrought in the domestic economy. The Nation's housewives are nearly unanimous in their view that the cost of living has risen in the past year—and they do not like the trend.

They are right, of course, in believing that the cost of living is going up. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that it went up 1.9 percent between June 1964 and June 1965. And the complaints of women about the increase in the cost of specific items reinforces the idea that they know what they are talking about. In those areas in which they handle most of the family's expenditures, their complaints about which items have gone up the most almost match in proportion the categories where the increases have been the greatest.

The potential political dynamite in the cost of living lies in the fact that, by nearly a 3-to-2 margin, women shoppers believe that increases can be avoided. Since 87 percent of all women think the cost of living is going up, this provides a margin of dis-

satisfaction that could spell trouble for political leaders.

Following is a table of items which a cross-section of the Nation's housewives cited as having gone up the most in the past year, compared to the latest Government figures. The 87 percent of the women who believe the cost of living has gone up were asked:

"Which items do you feel have gone up the most?"

Items that have gone up the most

[In percent]

	Housewife complaints	Consumer price index rise
Meat.....	46	+0.9
Vegetables and fruit.....	38	+4.7
Cereals and bakery products.....	32	+1.6
Clothing.....	20	+1.1
Other food.....	8	+2
Dairy products.....	7	-----
Utilities (gas, electric).....	3	-2
Transportation.....	1	+1.8
Medicine.....	1	+2.4
Rent.....	1	+1.8
Personal care.....	1	+1.7
Household furnishings.....	1	+2

NOTE.—Complaints total more than 100 percent because some mentioned more than 1 item.

Two facts are immediately apparent. First, it takes only a slight rise in the cost of an item to cause large numbers of women to single out that product as one in which prices have gone up. Second, while the areas in which they spend most of the family's budget—food and clothing—are the particular target of housewife complaints, transportation, medicine, rents, and personal care—which have increased close to the overall average of 1.9 percent—have escaped public awareness.

But the views of the women about rises in prices have established some firm opinions which have serious implications. In order to pinpoint where the blame is being leveled, the cross section was asked this question:

"What do you feel is the main cause for the rise in the cost of living: farm prices, wage increases, middlemen, Government spending, too high profits or what?"

Causes of the rise in cost of living

[In percent]

	Total housewives	Income group		
		Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$10,000	Over \$10,000
Middlemen.....	30	35	34	19
Wage increases.....	25	17	22	41
Government spending.....	22	22	18	31
Too high profits.....	7	5	8	7
Farm prices.....	4	4	4	2
Not sure.....	12	17	14	-----

Nationwide, the middlemen—primarily food processors, wholesalers and retailers—are the No. 1 target. But the pattern differs sharply by income groups. Lower income women tend to worry most about middlemen costs and are least critical of wage increases as inflationary pressures. In contrast, upper income women place the blame primarily on union demands, and secondly on Government spending. Obviously, there is a relationship between their views and their husbands' occupations.

A real question which economists pose about an economy such as ours, which is growing at a rate of over 6 percent a year, is whether consumer price rises are inevitable. The housewives of the Nation tend to say no. They were asked:

"Do you think that rises in the cost of living are bound to happen or do you feel they can be avoided?"

Are price rises inevitable?

[In percent]

	Bound to happen	Can be avoided	Not sure
Nationwide.....	33	46	21
By size of place:			
Cities.....	31	50	19
Suburbs.....	45	39	13
Towns.....	20	59	21
Rural.....	33	35	32
By income group:			
Under \$5,000.....	11	68	21
\$5,000 to \$10,000.....	40	40	20
Over \$10,000.....	34	52	14

The political impact of the issue could be potent, and it now appears to be looming up as a storm center of major magnitude.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 8, 1965]

MEAT COUNTER BLUES

If Lyndon Johnson had to run for office today—and there's a school of thought that claims he's always running—the cost of living might well rank as a major domestic issue.

Housewives are griping. The Consumer Price Index has hit a record 110.2 percent of the 1957-59 (Eisenhower GOP era) average. And although such general factors as auto insurance and homeownership costs help account for the rise, food prices seem to be the scapegoat since they pose an immediate, conspicuous target.

To be sure, the farmers are having a wonderful year. Gross farm income is at a record peak of \$43.3 billion, net income will total an estimated \$13.5 billion in 1965, highest in 12 years, and the prices for beef and pork are bringing smiles to the growers.

At the retail counter, however, it's another matter. A recent poll of housewives found that 46 percent of complaints about the general cost of living centered on meat prices, with other equally important items such as rents and transportation trailing far behind.

Yet, to blame the farmer for all the inflation is manifestly unfair. According to Government figures, farmers last year received only 37 cents on every dollar spent at retail counters for food. Middlemen accounted for the rest.

The fact is that the cost-of-living index is computed from a list of some 300 goods and services ranging from refrigerators to haircuts, along with food. To say that farmers are prospering at the expense of city dwellers is to ignore the costly contracts that have been negotiated in auto, aluminum, steel, and other industries in the past year. These are the basic industries that pass on to the whole economy their inflationary settlements.

The housewife may not notice their impact every Friday on her shopping list, but before we impeach the Iowa and Texas meat producers, let's keep in mind that inflation, like termites, usually attacks from several directions.

THRIFT AND PROGRESS

(Radio talk by R. K. Bliss, extension service of Iowa State University, Sept. 3, 1965)

Thrift is almost a forgotten word in our present-day vocabulary. It was not always that way. Older people, especially those in their seventies, and eighties, had a good training in thrift, but what about the training of our young people now?

Today I would like to visit with you for a little while about the importance of thrift. To begin with, thrift does not mean miserliness and parsimony. Thrift means economical management, frugality, care and wisdom in management and intelligent use of our resources. Thrift is the opposite of wastefulness and extravagance. People that